

# CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

AND

## THE REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE, Vol. XI.  
REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES, Vol. VI.

JUNE, 1894.

No. 2  
No. 2

### THE AMERICAN CHURCHES.

IN this department we usually take no notice of what occurs in Great Britain, leaving that to the English editors, but, as Americans, we are interested in many events which occur there, and now and then desire to express our appreciation of men and movements. The fact that Doctor Joseph Parker has completed a quarter of a century of service in the City Temple of London interests a far larger company than those who are able personally to express their appreciation of him and of his work. In a very true sense he belongs to the American churches as to the English.

On the 10th of May, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the settlement of Joseph Parker, D.D., over the City Temple in London, was appropriately celebrated. A testimonial was presented to him, to which contributions were made by Doctor Parker's many friends in Great Britain and various parts of the world. This celebration was an event of more than ordinary importance. Joseph Parker is without doubt the most conspicuous figure in English Nonconformity. A very different man from Charles H. Spurgeon, he is intellectually, at least in the opinion of most who were acquainted with both men, greatly the superior. He possesses some mannerisms which are disliked by many people, but, on the whole, is one of the noblest figures in the world's pulpit—a poet, an orator, a great expounder of the Bible, a man of tireless industry, a friend of the people, a leader in all true reforms, a preacher whose voice in behalf of righteousness has never failed, and to those who know him in his private life a man of greatest kindness and generosity. He was born at Hexam-on-Tyne, April 9, 1830, and was educated at the University College, London. His father was a Northumbrian stone-cutter. His first parish was at Banbury, where he remained five years; his second in Cavendish Chapel, Manchester,

where he remained eleven years. He was settled in London in 1869. His present church, which is one of the features of the metropolis, is located on Holborn Viaduct. He was Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in 1884, which is the highest position in the gift of English Congregationalists. Doctor Parker is a voluminous author. His "People's Bible," in twenty-five volumes, represents his preaching for many years. In his pulpit he has expounded the Bible from Genesis to Revelation. His other books, such as "The Paraclete," "Ecce Deus," "Ad Clerum," and "The Old Sword," are well known. Theologically he may be called an eclectic. No man is more devoted to the Bible, and no one more responsive to modern thought. He is thoroughly independent. In personal appearance Doctor Parker is a tall, broad-shouldered, lion-visaged man. He is now about sixty-four years of age. In politics he is a liberal, in the contest between Church and state an advanced advocate of disestablishment, a total abstainer, and an advocate of the poor man's rights in all legitimate contests against oppression. No one can understand what Doctor Parker's work has been who has not studied it. His church is in the heart of the business part of the city. All the other churches in that vicinity are comparatively empty; his building, which seats 2,500, is always full. His Thursday noon service is usually attended by from 1,500 to 2,000 people. He has probably done more to influence the life and mould the thinking of the average minister than almost any other man in England or America. We are not unmindful of the criticisms made upon him—they are not more numerous than are made on most public men and no better founded—but in our opinion the man is so much greater than his mannerisms that there is no need of reference to them at this time. For twenty-five years, in the throbbing centre of the world's business life, his pulpit has uttered a constant and persua-

sive message in favor of righteousness and the kingdom of God. His home is in Lyndhurst Gardens, Hampstead, some miles from his church. Those who have been permitted to enter it and enjoy the hospitality which is dispensed in such a gracious and queenly way by the companion of Doctor Parker in all his toils and travels, will need no reminder of the charming domestic life that is behind the public ministry. It was fitting and proper that those among whom he has labored so successfully for twenty-five years should unite in recognizing Doctor Parker's work in London. The testimonial which was presented to him was, however, but a very inadequate recognition of the debt of gratitude felt by many men in many lands. May his quarter century of service be extended to a Jubilee!

**Bishop Seymour and Bishop Brooks.** In the last issue of this Review there was a reference to the Bishop of Springfield and his relation to the late Bishop Brooks which has called forth a letter from the former. It should be noticed, however, that the reference to Bishop Seymour was not made in that part of the Review which is edited in this country. It came from the other side. None the less, however, we are glad to do our part toward correcting what may be a false impression, and we know no better way of doing it than by allowing Bishop Seymour to speak for himself, which we do in the following letter:

MAY 15, 1894.

DEAR SIR: I address you upon a single point, and my interest in it is not so much personal as it is general.

On page 18 of the May number of *CHRISTIAN LITERATURE*, etc., I am referred to under this description: "The Bishop of Springfield known to the readers of this Review as the bitter assailant of Bishop Phillips Brooks."

I submit that this statement, and it covers the Review too, presents me in an attitude which I never occupied towards Bishop Brooks.

I never felt, nor so far as I know, ever expressed the slightest bitterness towards him personally.

On the contrary my feelings towards him were friendly, as will be seen in my brief review of his career printed for distribution, a copy of which I enclose, and which I venture to ask you to do me the honor and kindness to read.

My contention was and is that Doctor Phillips Brooks' position as a man, whose baptism was very doubtful, and whose avowed beliefs in his published writings were absolutely irreconcilable with the fundamental principle of the teaching of the standards of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was disqualified from taking the oath of conformity and receiving consecration.

In making known my position, and doing all in my power to stop, if I can, the violence done to truth and good morals in admitting to our episcopate men who openly repudiate by word and deed the essential doctrines of our Church, I may have laid myself open to the allegation of bitterness, but its direction was not towards him, who was the subject of the controversy, but towards those who espoused his cause, and seem to have made him believe that he could lawfully and safely take that awful oath, pledging him by soul and heart and lip to accept and hold and teach and protect as truth, what he had avowed up to the date of his consecration he did not accept. In the brief time allowed him to manifest his position after he became a Bishop, he showed that he was the same in mind as he had been before. The placing me in a false position is a very small matter, too small to deserve notice, but the principle involved in the mistake is of the very greatest importance.

I am satisfied that it is a mistake, that there is no desire to do me injustice, and hence I do not seek redress for myself, but I crave for the sake of the cause of truth and righteousness that the real issue may be made clear and manifest to all.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE F. SEYMOUR.

**Episcopalian and Reformed Episcopalian.**

In our last number we published a letter from Alfred W. Wishart, of the University of Chicago, in which he said that the Reformed Protestant Episcopal Church of America accepts all four of the Chicago-Lambeth Proposals, and then asked why the Protestant Episcopal Church does not invite the members of the Reformed Church, some of whom she excommunicated, to return to the fold?" In reply we have received the following letter from G. Woolsey Hodge, General Secretary of the Church Unity Society of Philadelphia.

MR. EDITOR: You ask in your last issue why "the Protestant Episcopal Church does not invite the members of the Re-

formed Episcopal Church back to the fold?" She most lovingly does so, and quite a number individually have accepted the invitation and returned. But she cannot accomplish a reunion with the whole of the Reformed body unless the latter is willing to unite.

The Episcopal Church did not force the members of the Reformed Church out of her fold. Not a canon, or rubric, or requirement of the Church had in any way been altered or made between the time of their ordination, or admission, into the Church and their leaving it, which could in any way be construed as the cause of their leaving. They left, not because their own liberty was abridged, but because they would not stay in a communion which allowed the same liberty to others as they claimed for themselves.

Most gladly would the Episcopal Church enter into any negotiations with a view to their return, were there any willingness on their part to do so. But naturally those who have been the last to separate will be the least likely at present to return.

The question, therefore, which you address to your "readers in the Protestant Episcopal Church," should be put to those in the Reformed Church. Truly yours,

G. WOOLSEY HODGE,

General Secretary of the Church Unity Society.

Philadelphia, May 16, 1894.

**Remarks on the  
Above.**

An interesting question arises in connection with the above correspondence, which is not answered in the letter of Doctor Hodge. Surely the Bishops of the Reformed Episcopal Church are in the line of the historic episcopate; they have received their ordination from the same source as, for instance, Bishop Seymour or Bishop Potter. If, now, a group of Presbyterian churches should desire to realize the unity suggested by the Lambeth Proposals, but should prefer to receive their episcopate from a Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Church, would that be recognized as valid and regular by the Protestant Episcopal Church? We express no opinion concerning it, but can see no reason why ordination from one Bishop would not be as regular as from the other.

**The New Jersey  
Declaration.**

The reception given to the declaration concerning Church Unity by the Congressional Association of New Jersey has far exceeded what was anticipated by those

who prepared the report. This report was published in full in the May number of this Review. In less than a month from the time when the action was taken, four State Associations of Congregational Churches had adopted the report as their own, namely: those of Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Kansas, and other associations, without waiting for the formal communication from the New Jersey committee, have already given it a place upon their docket. As was to be expected, many have misunderstood its significance, and read into it what surely it does not contain—a surrender of Congregational principles. We cannot understand how any one could read this declaration with ordinary care and come to any such conclusion. Its special emphasis is upon the fact that union must begin among those who hold the same general polity. It expresses the willingness of the New Jersey churches to confer with their brethren of the Episcopal Church on the basis of the Chicago-Lambeth Proposals, and also declares that there could be no objection to the adoption of those proposals, provided the interpretation which is given to them in both denominations is fairly respected. Perhaps the most significant statement which has been made on this subject was at the General Assembly by the venerable Doctor Smith, of Baltimore, Chairman of the Assembly's Committee on Church Union, in which he said that the New Jersey Declaration was one of the most important documents on the subject which has appeared during the last two hundred years. Those who prepared the report were not foolish enough to imagine that they had spoken the final word, but they did hope that they might secure among Congregationalists due consideration of this subject. Unless we are mistaken, in that respect, at least they will not be disappointed. The ideal basis of unity is probably not yet in sight. The Church will be united as the result of a long process of growth. Only vital unity is desirable. The attention which the subject is receiving is a most encouraging sign as to what the ultimate outcome will be.

**The General  
Assembly.**

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church has come and gone and done the work which it was expected to do. Before it met it was clearly stated what the programme would be, and that programme has been carried out in every respect. Practically a ban has been put upon thorough

theological education in the denomination, and one of the most gifted men in the whole body, a man whose spirit was beyond criticism, and whose Christian character and bearing were in strange contrast with that of many who were prosecuting him, has been condemned by a majority of four to one. Nine-tenths of those voting against him had not the slightest idea of the merits of the question concerning which they were voting. Some very interesting events occurred at that General Assembly which may not get into print, one of which we reproduce here. While Professor Smith was making his plea, the presidents of three of the most prominent Baptist theological seminaries in the United States were sitting on the platform. They were reported, on what we believe to be unimpeachable authority, to have said afterward that the address of Professor Smith was absolutely convincing. They were competent judges, and all conservatives, and in private conversation at least, if they are not incorrectly reported, they acquitted, but the farmers and grocers convicted. Dr. D. R. Breed, of Chicago, who is nothing if not straightforward and manly, hit the nail squarely on the head in his address against Professor Smith, when he said it was not a question of the Bible, but of the Standards. Indeed it has seemed to us that there were no more manly addresses delivered than those by Dr. Breed, on the conservative side, and Dr. Hillis on the liberal. The saddest part of the whole business is that so large a number were willing to stultify their consciences enough to vote about a subject of which they were ignorant. Of course the end is not yet, but we fear that one of the most prominent professors of Princeton was right when he said after the meeting in Washington, "The mistake of the liberals is that they do not realize that they have met a Waterloo defeat." The Assembly was largely composed of unknown and untried men. Few of the old leaders were at the front or even present. Not one of the great cities of the country was represented by its conspicuous pastors. In a few instances, like Chicago, one or two prominent men were on the delegation, but as a whole the Assembly was composed of men hitherto unknown. Another curious feature in its composition was the prominence of that form of Presbyterianism which has its home in Kentucky. If we remember correctly the last three moderators of the General Assembly have been graduates of Danville, namely, Drs. Young, Craig, and Mutchmore. The action of the Assembly concerning the

seminaries cannot be otherwise than disastrous to sound, scholarly study of the Bible. The Assembly at its best is often only a mass meeting. It is no disrespect to it to say that it may now and then be stampeded by an eloquent man. Theological education can never prosper where professors are given so little freedom, and where the most learned men in the church are often made responsible to the most ignorant. What will be the future of the liberal party—that party represented by almost all the strong men in our large cities—we will not predict. One thing, however, is certain—either they must leave the Presbyterian Church, or else that Church will be put in the awkward position of being obliged to endure those who in public and in private repudiate its action, denounce its decisions, and defy its authority. Hundreds of the ablest and best men in the Church are doing that to-day. Will they be allowed to continue? or, will they be willing to continue? These are interesting questions. We give to our readers an extract from the report adopted concerning the control of the theological seminaries. It is as follows:

**The  
Majority Report.**

The action of the Assembly taken directs that all of the seminaries of the Church shall be requested to make the following changes in their charters:

First—(a) That all of their funds and property subject to the terms and conditions of existing or specific tracts shall be declared to be held by them in trust for the Presbyterian Church for the purposes of theological education according to the standard of said Church, and that no part of the funds and property so held in trust shall be used for any other purpose than for theological education in the doctrines set forth in the standards of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; (b) that the election of the trustees, directors, or commissioners, or whatever the bodies governing the teaching or property shall be called, shall be subject to the approval of the next succeeding General Assembly, and that no election shall take effect until approved by the General Assembly; (c) that the election, appointment, or transfer of all professors and teachers in all seminaries shall be submitted to the next succeeding General Assembly for its approval, and that no such election, appointment, or transfer shall take effect, nor shall any professor or teacher be inducted into office until his election, appointment, or transfer shall have been approved



by the said General Assembly, and that all of said professors and teachers shall be either ministers or members in good standing of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; (d) that in the event of the violation of any of the terms of said amendments, or the misuse or the diversion of the funds or property held by them, then the General Assembly shall be empowered to provide against such violation of the provisions of said charters and for the enforcement of the same, and for the protection of the trusts on which said property and funds are held, in such manner and in the name of such person or corporation as it may direct by resolution certified by its clerk in any civil court having jurisdiction over the corporations whose charters are so amended.

Second—That all seminaries hereafter established or organized shall contain in their charters the foregoing provisions as an essential part thereof before they shall be recognized as in connection with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Third—That the General Assembly, having adopted the foregoing resolutions, appoint a committee of fifteen persons to confer with the various seminaries, with a view to securing their approval of said resolutions and their consent to said changes in their charters, and for the purpose of aiding them by counsel and otherwise in securing the necessary changes and amendments to the respective charters herein recommended, it being understood that the adoption of said resolutions is without impairment of any of the rights of the General Assembly or of said seminaries that may have accrued by the compact of 1870, and said committee to make report to the next General Assembly for final action on this whole subject by the Assembly.

As reported in the daily press 94 of the 116 votes cast in the negative came from the Synod of New York, and 11 of the remainder came from Ohio. Only half a dozen New Jersey men voted in the minority. The large Synod of Pennsylvania stood 75 to 8 in favor of the report. The entire New York City delegation present voted for the report.

**Religion in Texas.** The title of this paragraph is taken from one of the most prominent of our daily papers, and is an editorial on recent events which have occurred in Texas, as they are described by a Houston paper. The Texan

paper says: "If Bishop Kinsolving and Rector Aves want to mix niggers and white people in religion, or any other kind of social equality, they have come to the wrong place. Such John Brownism will not be tolerated, and for the sake of peace they are advised to leave Texas. The best plan is to fire them both out of the community." The circumstances which evoked this strange outburst of malignity are reported to have been as follows: Doctor Aves, the rector of a prominent church, invited a colored man, the Rev. Mr. Thompson, to a place in the chancel during an evening service. Mr. Thompson is charged with no crime except his color. When he appeared in front of the altar it is said that a large number of persons left the church, and that for some days afterward the community was in a state of great excitement. We should hesitate to believe such things if we did not know that similar incidents have occurred elsewhere and repeatedly for many years. If they were political events we should not refer to them in these columns, but when those who bear the name of "Christian" are so utterly unmindful of all that constitute the Christian character, and so utterly forgetful of the fundamental principle of the doctrine of Christ, every one who has the slightest influence ought to raise his voice in indignant protest. We know very well that these malcontents who found a champion in the Houston paper are not the Episcopal Church; that is far more worthily represented by Bishop Kinsolving and Rector Aves. Doctor Kinsolving is one of the strong men of our time, both intellectually and physically. He will not easily be frightened from the discharge of his duty, and, unless we have wrongly estimated him, will not be driven from his post by any such absurd measures as have been directed against him. This incident serves once more to bring up the old question as to what constitutes Christianity, and whether that can be the true church of Christ which makes prominent a creed and a ritual, but forgets brotherhood; and whether any man can be a Christian who satisfies himself with assuming the name while he forgets every distinctive principle for which the Master lived and died. We hope that Bishop Kinsolving will fight his battle to the end. It is the old battle of Christ against the Pharisees. There is sad need in many parts of our country of leaders who are really Christians, and who cannot be intimidated by selfishness and wickedness.

### The Theological Seminaries.

This is the season for the anniversaries of the theological seminaries, and already many of the most prominent have ceased their work for the year and graduated large classes of young men who are looking toward the ministry as their lifework. Union and Princeton, the Congregational and Presbyterian seminaries in Chicago, Rochester and Newton among the Baptists, Drew among the Methodists, Pacific among the Congregationalists, and doubtless still others, have held their commencements. These events vary little from year to year in interest or importance except for the students themselves. In three or four instances, however, there have been events which require special mention. Princeton has inaugurated a Professor of Biblical Theology, Dr. Vos, of whom great things are expected. Pacific Seminary has chosen as its President the Rev. Doctor J. K. McLean, pastor of one of the strongest churches on the Pacific coast, and, greatly to the delight of the friends of the seminary, he has accepted the position. Chicago Theological Seminary elected as Professor of Systematic Theology the Rev. James Denny, of Scotland, who made a profound impression by a course of lectures recently delivered in that city. In some respects he is considered very orthodox, but being in sympathy with the present critical movement in the study of the Scriptures five of the directors voted against his election. Probably the most important utterance at any of the seminaries this year was the superb address of Doctor Charles H. Parkhurst, at Union Seminary, on "The Ministry and Municipal Government." The address was full of the characteristic thought and style of Doctor Parkhurst, delivered with the greatest intensity, and produced a profound impression. No one could have heard it, realizing that everything which he advised others to do Doctor Parkhurst had already done himself, without feeling that the sphere of the Christian ministry was not narrowing but rather enlarging. His tribute to the power of the pulpit was one of the finest passages in his magnificent address. He does not believe that it is growing less, but rather that it is daily increasing. Before this Review reaches our readers most of the other seminaries will have completed their work for the year.

### A Great Editor Gone.

Few editors of religious papers in this country in recent years have exerted a stronger influence than Edward Bright,

D.D., who may be said to have made the *Examiner* what it is. He died on the 17th of May. For many years he had been one of the most positive forces in the Baptist denomination in the United States. The funeral services were held at the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church, and conducted by its pastor, the Rev. Doctor Faunce, assisted by Doctors Edward Judson and H. M. Saunders. Before offering the final prayer Doctor Faunce read a brief autobiography which Doctor Bright had dictated to his wife and to which he had affixed his initials. It is as follows:

"October 6, 1885.—This is my birthday. I was born on this day of 1808 in my father's farm-house near Kington, a market town of Herefordshire, England.

"It was at Kington I went to school and to Sunday-school, my father and mother being members of a little Baptist church at that place. When I was eleven years old my father came to this country with all his family. I have found this a pleasant world to live in, and my health is now so good that it seems like a dream that I should have seen so many birthdays. Surely goodness and mercy have followed me all the days of my life.—E. B."

Doctor Bright's various fields of labor were as pastor in Homer, N. Y., Secretary of the Missionary Union, and Editor of the *Examiner*. He was in all his career very conservative, and intensely loyal to Baptist principles. Few men of our time have impressed themselves more deeply upon the people by whom they were surrounded. His true monument will be in the paper which he founded and which he left without a superior among the Baptist papers of the country or the world.

The April number of the new *Christian Quarterly*, which is the organ of the denomination known as the Disciples of Christ, has a valuable article with the title at the head of this paragraph. The article is worthy of more general attention than it will receive from those who are usually readers of the Review. The author aims to answer the inquiry whether it is possible to realize Christian union on the basis of a compromise. His first question is, Would it be right? and his answer, This would depend upon several considerations—first, whether the error would be fatal, like denying that Jesus is the Christ. His conclusion is that no such compromise could be made. On the other hand, there might be compromise concerning anything which is not

essential to salvation. He says that to deny or affirm the doctrine of open or close communion is not a sin unto spiritual death; neither is an honest error as to the action or design of baptism. Speaking for his own denomination, he says: "Our ignorance and lack of obedience may not relate to the same commandments as those in other religious bodies, but if our failures relate to commands of equal magnitude we are equally guilty with them." Second, there might be compromise if all the religious bodies would cordially agree to take the Word of God as their only guide in determining the questions at issue, all accepting that, and working together. They would find in work the true solvent of their difficulties. He says a very few decades of such loving labor, earnest prayer, and Bible-reading would probably do more to remove obstructions to Christian union, that now seem immovable, than all the pugilistic encounters that might occur throughout the twentieth century. But perhaps the most striking part of the essay is the one in which the author shows that the differences between the Jew and the Gentile churches in Apostolic times were far greater than those now existing among the various denominations. If the Jewish and Gentile Christians could work together in unity, why may not Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, and Episcopalians? He even indicates his belief that there was more error in the Apostolic churches than in some of those in modern times; and yet they co-operated. The Jerusalem church did not allow the one sacrifice for sin to displace confidence in circumcision; the Corinthian church entirely misunderstood the sacrament of the Supper; and yet we are proud of our lin-

eage. The conclusion of this part of the essay is as follows: "It is plain that the answer must come from the question whether we would thereby temporarily compromise truth more than the Apostles did, as the instances above given may decide." He believes that the study of the Scriptures, and the Scriptures alone, would bring the desired result. To a further inquiry as to whether this plan would succeed, he gives an affirmative answer—first, because any number of honest scholars studying the same book would naturally imbibe the same truths; and second, because the coming generation would feel under less obligation to cleave unto what their fathers taught, if not in the Word of God. We can imagine that some may say that the churches are taking the Bible for their only authority. The reply would necessarily be that that is not true. In most of the denominations the ultimate appeal is not to the Scriptures, but to the creeds. The case of Professor Briggs has never been tried in its relation to the Bible; the General Assembly assumes that its standards are infallible, and summons the Professor to that bar. The writer of the article to which we have referred, Mr. Thomas Munnell, would have the creeds themselves honestly and impartially brought once more to the Bible; but would have no definite decision reached until the denominations for a long time had worked together, with the creeds out of sight and the Bible in the forefront. We are inclined to think that he is not unduly confident of what the effect would be. This article is especially noteworthy as coming from a denomination which puts so much emphasis upon baptism by immersion.

## EVOLUTION AND CHRISTIANITY.

### I.

BY PROFESSOR HENRY DRUMMOND.

From *The British Weekly* (London), May 3, 1894.

[We reprint the following article, by permission from the official report of the World's Parliament of Religions at Chicago.]

NO MORE fit theme could be chosen for discussion at this congress than the relation of Christianity and evolution. Evolution—and by that I do not mean Darwinism, which is not yet proved, nor Spencerianism, which is incomplete, nor Weismannism, which is in the hottest fires of criticism,

but evolution as a great category of thought is the supreme word of the nineteenth century. More than that, it is the greatest generalization the world has ever known.

The mere presence of this doctrine to science has reacted as by an electric induction on every surrounding circle of thought.

Whether we like it or not, whether we shun the change, or court it, or dread it, it has come, and we must set ourselves to meet it. No truth now can remain unaffected by evolution. We can no longer take out a doctrine in this century or in that, bottle it like a vintage, and store it in our creeds. We see truth now as a profound ocean still, but with a slow and ever-rising tide. Theology must reckon with this tide. We can store this truth in our vessels, for the formulation of doctrine must never stop; but the vessels, with their mouths open, must remain in the ocean. If we take them out the tide cannot rise in them, and we shall only have stagnant doctrines rotting in a dead theology.

To the student of God's ways, who reverently marks His progressive revelation and scans the horizon for each new fulfilment, the field of science under the influence of this great doctrine, presents just now a spectacle of bewildering interest. To say that he regards it with expectation is feebly to realize the dignity and import of the time. He looks at science with awe. It is the thing that is moving, unfolding. It is the breaking of a fresh seal. It is the new chapter of the world's history. What it contains for Christianity, or against it, he knows not. What it will do, or undo—for in the fulfilling it may undo—he cannot tell. The plot is just at its thickest as he opens the page; the problems are more in number and more intricate than they have ever been before, and he waits almost with excitement for the next development.

And yet this attitude of Christianity towards science is as free from false hope as it is from false fear. It has no false fear, for it knows the strange fact that this plot is always at its thickest; and its hope of a quick solution is without extravagance, for it has learned the slowness of God's unfolding and His patient tempering of revelation to the young world which has to bear the strain. But for all this, we cannot open this new and closely written page as if it had little to give us. With nature as God's work; with man, God's finest instrument, as its investigator; with a multitude of the finest of these fine instruments, in laboratory, field, and study, hourly engaged upon this book, exploring, deciphering, sifting, and verifying—it is impossible that there should not be a solid, original, and ever-increasing gain.

The idea of gain for religion to be made out of its relations with science is almost a new thing. Its realization with whatever partial success is by far the most striking

feature of the present situation. The intercourse between these two, until very recently, was remote, suspicious, and strained. After the first great quarrel—for they began the centuries hand in hand—the question of religion to science was the peremptory one: "How dare you speak at all?" Then, as science held to its right to speak, the question became more pungent: "What new menace to our creed does your latest discovery portend?" By and by both grew wiser, and the coarser conflict ceased. For a time we find religion suggesting a compromise, and asking simply what particular adjustments to its latest hypothesis science would demand. But all that is changed. We do not now speak of the right to be heard, or of menaces to our faith, or even of compromises. Our question is a maturer one—we ask what *contribution* science has to bestow, what good gift the wise men are bringing now to lay at the feet of our Christ.

To survey the field, therefore, for the mere purpose of celebrating the triumphs of religion and science is, let us hope, an extinct method. True science is as much a care of true theology as any branch of truth, and if it is necessary for a few moments to approach the subject partly in an apologetic attitude, the final object is to show, not how certain old theological conceptions have saved their skins in recent conflicts, but that they have come out of the struggle enriched, purified, and enlarged.

I. The first fact to be registered is that evolution has swept over the doctrine of creation and left it untouched, except for the better. The stages in the advance here are easily noted. Working in its own field, science made the discovery of how God made the world. To science itself this discovery was as startling and as unexpected as it has ever been to theology. Exactly fifty years ago Mr. Darwin wrote in dismay to Hooker that the old theory of specific creation—that God made all species apart and introduced them into the world one by one—was melting away before his eyes. He unburdens the thought, as he says in his letter, almost "as if he were confessing a murder." But so entirely has the world bowed to the weight of the facts before which even Darwin trembled, that one of the last books on Darwinism, by so religious a mind as that of Mr. Alfred Russell Wallace, contains in its opening chapter these words: "The whole scientific and literary world, even the whole educated public, accept as a matter of common knowledge the origin of species from other



allied species, by the ordinary process of natural birth. The idea of special creation, or any other exceptional mode of production, is absolutely extinct." Theology, after a period of hesitation, accepted this version on the whole. The hesitation was not due, as is often supposed, to prejudice. What theology waited for was what science itself was waiting for—the arrival of the proof.

That the doctrine of evolution is proved yet, no one will assert. That in some of its forms it is never likely to be proved, many are even convinced. It will be time for theology to be unanimous about it when science is unanimous about it. Yet it would be idle not to record the fact that in a general form it has received the widest assent from modern theology. And there is nothing here but gain. If science is satisfied, even in a general way, with its theory of evolution as the method of creation, "assent" is a cold word with which those whose business it is to know and love the ways of God should welcome it. It is needless at this time of day to point out the surpassing grandeur of the new conception. How it has filled the Christian imagination and kindled to enthusiasm the soberest scientific minds from Darwin downwards is known to every one. For that splendid hypothesis we cannot be too grateful to science; and that theology can only enrich itself, which gives it even temporary place in its doctrine of creation. The theory of evolution fills a gap at the very beginning of our religion; and no one who looks now at the transcendent spectacle of the world's past as disclosed by science, will deny that it has filled it worthily. Yet, after all, its beauty is not the part of its contribution to Christianity which one emphasizes here. Scientific theology required a new view, though it did not require it to come in so magnificent a form. What it needed was a credible presentation, in view especially of astronomy, geology, palæontology, and biology. These, as we have said, had made the former theory simply untenable. And science has supplied theology with a theory which the intellect can accept, and which for the devout mind leaves everything more worthy of worship than before.

As to the time-honored question of the relation of that theory to the Book of Genesis, it may surely be said that theology has now no longer any difficulty. The long and interesting era of the "reconcilers" is to be looked upon as past. That was a necessary era. With the older views of

revelation there was no alternative but to harmonize the Mosaic cosmogony with palæontology. And no more gallant or able attempts were ever made to bridge an apparently serious gulf than were the "Reconciliations" of Hugh Miller and Chalmers, of Kurtz and Guyot, and the band of brilliant men who spent themselves over this great apology. But the solution, when it came, reached us from quite another quarter.

For, wholly apart from this problem, theology meantime was advancing in new directions. The science of Biblical criticism was born. The doctrine of evolution, casting its transforming light over every branch of knowledge, came in time to be applied to the literature and doctrine of the Old Testament. Under the new light the problem of the reconciliation of Genesis and science simply disappeared. The two things lay in different regions, no bridge was necessary and none was called for. Genesis was not a scientific but a religious book, and there being no science there, for theologians to put it there, or "reconcile" as if it were there, was seen to be a mistake. This new position is as impregnable as it is final. Genesis is a presentation of one or two great elementary truths to the childhood of the world. It can only be read aright in the spirit in which it was written, with its original purpose in view and its original audience. Dating from the childhood of the world, written for children, and for that child-spirit in man which remains unchanged by time, it takes color and shape accordingly. Its object is purely religious, the point being not how certain things were made—which is a question for science which the revealer of truth has everywhere left to science—but that God made them. It is not dedicated to science, but to the soul. It is a sublime theology, a hymn of creation, given in view of idolatry or polytheism, telling the worshipful youth of the earth that the heavens and the earth and every flying and creeping thing were made by God.

This conclusion, and it cannot be too widely asserted, is now a commonplace with scientific theology. The misfortune is that, with the broken state of the churches, there is no one to announce in the name of theology that this controversy is at an end. The theological world needs nothing as much just now as a clearing-house, a register office, a something akin to the ancient councils, where the legitimate gains of theological science may be registered, the new advances chronicled, popular errors,

exploded, and authoritative announcements made of the exact position of affairs. The waste of time both to friends and foes—to friends in laboriously proving what is settled, to foes in ingloriously slaying the slain—is a serious hindrance to the progress of truth; and could any council have dealt with this controversy, let us say, as a British Association with Bathybius—the religious world would be

spared such paltry spectacles as Mr. Huxley annihilating Mr. Gladstone in presence of a blaspheming enemy, over a problem which, to real theology, is non-existent. Probably nine-tenths of the “modern attacks” upon religion from the side of science are assaults upon positions which theological science has itself discredited, but whose disclaimers, for want of a suitable platform to announce them from, have not been heard.

## OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM.

From *The Quarterly Review* (London), April, 1894.

- ART. V.—1. *Christus Comprobator; or, the Testimony of Christ to the Old Testament*. Seven Addresses by C. J. Ellicott, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Fifth Edition. London, 1893.
2. *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*. A Course of Lectures on Biblical Criticism. By W. Robertson Smith. Second Edition. London and Edinburgh, 1892.
3. *The Early Religion of Israel*. The Baird Lecture for 1889. By James Robertson, D.D., Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Glasgow. Third Edition. Edinburgh and London, 1892.
4. *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews*. By C. G. Montefiore. London and Edinburgh, 1892.
5. *Old Testament Theology. The Religion of Revelation in its Pre-Christian Stage of Development*. By Dr. Herman Schultz, Professor of Theology in the University of Göttingen. Translated by the Rev. J. A. Paterson. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1892.
6. *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*. By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology. New York, 1893.
7. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. By Julius Wellhausen, Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Marburg. Translated by T. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies. Edinburgh, 1885.
8. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. Von J. Wellhausen. Zweiter Druck. Berlin, 1889.
9. *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*. Genesis—Josua von Dr. August Dillmann (especially Introduction to first part, 1892, and Appendix to third part, “Ueber die Composition des Hexateuchs,” 1886).
10. *The Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*. By A. Kuenen, Professor of Theology at Leiden. Translated from the Dutch by Philip H. Wicksteed, M.A. London, 1886.
11. *Geschichte der Hebräer*. Von R. Kittel. Gotha, 1888–92.
12. *Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priestertums untersucht*. Von W. W. Graf Baudissin. Leipzig, 1889.
13. *Einleitung in den Hexateuch*. Von Lic. Dr. H. Holzinger. I. Text; II. Tabellen. Freiburg und Leipzig, 1893.
14. *Les Sources du Pentateuque*. Par Alexandre Westphal. Paris, Vol. I. 1888, Vol. II. 1892.
15. *The General Introductions*, especially those of Driver, De Wette-Schrader, Bleek-Wellhausen, Vatke-Preiss, Riehm-Brandt, Cornill, and König.

### SYNOPSIS.

THIS article on Old Testament Criticism is a very serious attempt, by one capable of the task, at estimating the present position of the controversy, and affording churchmen some guidance at a time when the conflict of opinions is apt to cause distress. It is not difficult to see in which direction the writer's sympathies lie; but equally we discern a sense of responsibility to the unlearned, which we could wish were preserved on all hands. Bishop Elli-

cott has declared that the whole matter is for the Christian “foreclosed by the definite statements of our Lord;” our essayist, or reviewer, differs from his lordship, and sets out with the purpose of asking: 1. What is the traditional theory of the church? 2. What is the analytical theory? and 3. How far is modification of received opinion rendered necessary by the proved results of criticism? The Bishop's view of “tradition” is considered imperfect because

it fails "to keep prominent the important distinction between the active and passive senses of the term tradition;" yet we confess that any more satisfactory view is wanting in the review. The outcome of a brief examination of the Old Testament writings is said to be that "down to about the year B.C. 300 there is no external proof whatever of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, nor indeed of its existence as a writing," and "if we press the statements of the Pentateuch itself as to its own authority, the result is to obtain a declaration that the bulk of it is not Mosaic." Examination of the Apocrypha yields no different verdict, nor do pre-Christian sources give us "authoritative tradition as to the origin of Old Testament Scriptures, and still less . . . as to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch." The writer gives no hint as to the kind of expression he considers the books of the Old Testament ought to have contained for the satisfaction of critics, nor does he show that other canonical books than those of the Pentateuch fulfil his desire for definite claim to authorship. That belief in the Mosaic authorship had "grown up" by the time of Philo and Josephus is admitted, its origin cannot be traced; but neither is there any motive suggested for the attribution, a point which the reviewer has failed to notice, and thus creates the suspicion of an animus which we find elsewhere. Concerning our Lord's words, the reviewer insists that his "use of the commonly accepted terms to indicate the books of the Old Testament was not simply compliance with custom, but was the employment as the medium of thought of the only recognized symbols which could possibly convey that thought;" and, if so, all doctrinal questions may be dismissed, and no appeal to His witness can properly be made. Our Lord was not slow to correct erroneous inferences, whether popular or sectarian, from the Old Testament Books; and though, as the instances of correction concerned moral questions, it may be replied that the authorship of the Pentateuch had no moral bearing in His sight, and the commonly received opinion was sufficiently near the truth for His purpose, yet the task before the reviewer and the critics is to show that the development of the Pentateuch was so absolutely true to the lines of the Mosaic fragments that the whole might be consistently called the work of Moses. Our Lord rebuked certain false applications of Biblical statements; reason would suppose that the wrong use, if wrong, of an authoritative name would also have received correction. On the other hand, if the Pentateuch is an amplification we have it with Divine approbation. No other conclusion seems possible.

In noticing the evidence of the post-Christian period the reviewer passes without remark the curious fact that the early deniers of Mosaic authorship were heretical, and he does not hesitate to write the following remarkable statement: "There seems, indeed, good reason to believe that Rabbinic Judaism, when driven by the forces of Christianity into the straits of a defensive position forged as one of her last weapons the authority of Moses as the writer of

all the books of the Law, and that the Church, which had at first accepted from the Synagogue Moses as the great law-giver, accepted from the Talmud Moses as the infallible scribe." It is unnecessary for us to comment upon this sentence, further than to ask whether a church which had been instructed by One who "beginning from Moses and all the prophets interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself" can rightly be said to have "accepted Moses from the Synagogue?" It may be our stupidity, but, in a writer who criticises episcopal looseness of expression, we looked for exactness; we hope the words quoted are only evidences of want of care in selection. Passing over the interesting section on the early critics, Maes, Simon, etc., we come to the conclusions "established or probable." There are seventeen of them, and they but summarize the position we have already indicated, though we advise our readers to look at them carefully. The next inquiry is, how far the results of the analytical theory have been established? Again we must pass over the mention of names and works to give the conclusion, which is as follows: "If we ask how far the 'analytical theory' is consistent with the facts, it seems clear that only one answer can be given. We may admit that there is much to be said for it, that this has been said with conspicuous ability; and, except in rare instances, with conspicuous fairness; that this ability and fairness have won the adhesion of many who have competent knowledge of one side of the question, and of some who have competent knowledge of both; but we must add that there is much, very much to be said *per contra*, and that in its contention the case is NOT PROVEN, is not indeed in the present state of our knowledge provable." What, then, are church-men to do? Are they in Sunday-schools and Bible-classes to follow the advice of one expert, and tell their children that the Higher Critics say this and that? The reviewer suggests: (1) That the most reverential care should be taken how we use the authority of the Divine Revealer of Truth in deciding a matter of fact which is within the limits of human knowledge. (2) That as God inspired not books but men, if it could be proved that part of the Pentateuch is in its present form post-Exilic, this would not affect the substance, which must have existed in earlier written and oral forms. (3) Remember the cognate distinction between authorship and authority, and (4) scientifically investigate facts and welcome progress in knowledge. Do not claim at the very bulwark of our faith traditional statements which the Church has never made her own.

We will add only one word in conclusion: If the Church has never made any traditional statement her own on this question, is there not evidence that whenever ecclesiastical authority has had occasion to deal with "higher critics" the tendency, to say no more, has been to establish the traditional belief in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, making allowance for redactions and errors in transmission?—*The Church Times* (London).

A Bishop of the English Church who is entitled, by the dignity of his position and the reverence due to his years, by his accurate scholarship and his widely extended reading, by his anxious earnestness to defend his own position and his courteous fairness in stating that of his opponents, to the most respectful attention of his readers, has lately addressed his clergy on the trustworthiness of the Scriptures of the Old Testament and has told them that,

"independently of the sort of general feeling that the time has come when the discussion of such a subject cannot profitably be delayed, there are probably few of us who would not agree in the more particular conviction that recent circumstances have now made this discussion positively imperative, and of the most vital and urgent necessity."\*

And this opinion of the Bishop's seems to have been very generally shared. Old Testament criticism has been in the air. We have had not only the solemn episcopal charge and the learned professorial treatise, not only the discussion in theological reviews and so-called religious newspapers, but almost every pulpit has given its utterance, and the secular press has both expressed and testified to the force of these currents of thought.

We are perhaps almost alone in our silence upon the subject; and if such silence needs justification, we offer it in the fact that an investigation which is intended to be adequate would require a fulness of space which we could not afford, and technical details which are not consistent with the character of our pages; and also in the fact that the battle has been so fierce and the din and confusion of the war so great, that it has been hitherto difficult for an impartial looker-on to preserve entire freedom from heat and prejudice, or to track accurately the fortunes of the contending forces. We are not sure indeed that even now it is possible for us to do so, but the time has, we think, come when the attempt may fairly be made; and our readers have the right to expect at least some notice of a question which is occupying so much of general attention.

The principle which will guide us—indeed the only principle which is tenable in any such investigation—is expressed in the words of the learned prelate from whom we have already quoted: "Few will deny

that it is desirable that both sides should fairly be heard."† The plan of the campaign and the results of the struggle are moreover to be judged of as they are expressed in the despatches of the generals on either side, and not from the hasty deed of some raw volunteer, or from the party feeling of some untrained special correspondent. It would be very easy to quote alike from writers on the attacking or defensive sides hasty expressions, ill-considered arguments, confident assertions of their own powers, and equally confident assertions of the impotence of their foes; it would not be difficult to quote instances of imputations of ignorance, prejudice, dishonesty, wilful blindness to clear light, inconsistency with the office or profession of the writer. We have indeed made out, but we will spare our readers the pain of looking at, a not inconsiderable list of such expressions; but as we read them and think of the names attached to them, the pulpits from which they were spoken, the pages on which they were written, we are confident that their authors will in days of fuller knowledge and hours of calmer reflection wish that they had never been uttered:

"Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis  
Tempus eget; non, si ipse meus nunc ad-  
foret Hector."

In our application of the principle which we have adopted, we propose to confine our thoughts to a smaller area than that which engaged the Bishop's attention, for he had many pages at command, while we have but few; and we feel bound to look at the question from many points of view, while his special purpose was to show that the whole matter was for the Christian at least foreclosed by the definite statements of our Lord—an argument with which we shall feel compelled to express our respectful disagreement. While his work and some others, the titles of which are placed at the head of this article, deal with the Old Testament as a whole, we shall confine ourselves therefore for the present to the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua, or, as it is now becoming general, though not in our opinion strictly correct, to call these books, the Hexateuch.‡ But we gladly accept from the Bishop the terms "traditional theory" and "analytical theory" as convenient and roughly accurate short expressions for the older and commonly accepted

\* "Christus Comprobator," pp. 7-8.

† Ibid., Prefatory Notice.

‡ Cf. *infra*, p. 407.



view of the Old Testament Scriptures on the one hand, and the newer results of the so-called "higher criticism" on the other.

Our task then will be to inquire: (1) What is the "traditional theory," and how far is it firmly established? (2) What is the "analytical theory," and how far is it consistent with all the facts? (3) How far, if at all, is it necessary that our commonly received opinions should be modified by the proved results of fuller knowledge?

1. In seeking an answer to our first question, it will be convenient to find our point of departure in the Bishop's definition, which is the most careful as well as the most recent, and in general opinion—at least in this country—probably the most authoritative, statement of it:

"We begin, then, by defining what we mean by the term that we are using—the traditional view of the Old Testament. We mean that view of the contents, their authorship, and their trustworthiness, that prevailed in the Jewish Church after the final formation of the Canon of the Old Testament—that is clearly to be recognized in the New Testament—and has continued in the Christian Church, with but little substantial modification, to this nineteenth century of salvation."\*

In the immediate context of this formal definition the Bishop speaks of

"that traditional view of the characteristics and composition of the Old Testament, which, with some modifications, has existed for two and twenty centuries; and which, we may very confidently say, will substantially remain to the end. Modifications there may be. Each age as it passes suggests, it may be, some rectifications. Each period of controversy like the present necessitates a closer study, both of matter and of language, and consequently a clearer perception of those details in which surer knowledge enables us to introduce rectifications and corrections. These modifications we may expect, but subversive changes in the estimate of the true nature of Holy Scripture, such as those which we are now invited to accept, will never enter into the *credenda* of the Catholic Church."†

Now we cannot suppose that it escaped the attention of those who heard these words from the venerable prelate, or that it has been unobserved by some of the many readers of the various editions in

which they have since been printed, that these statements are not free from some confusion of thought, and that in particular they fail to keep prominent the important distinction between the active and passive senses of the term *tradition*—between the process, that is, by which the accepted doctrine of the Jewish and Christian Churches has been handed down to us, and that doctrine itself. If "each age as it passes" is to suggest "some rectifications," then the fact that the "traditional view" comes to us through the history of two and twenty centuries weakens rather than strengthens its original force, for

"mobilitate viget viresque acquirit eundo;"

and our present "rectified" view has no sufficient claim to be part of the "*credenda* of the Catholic Church," for the well-known Vincentian rule is

"quod ubique quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est. Hoc est etenim vere proprium catholicum."

To claim that a truth was accepted at a time when there was full knowledge of the subject and every opportunity of forming an opinion, and has been handed down to us without modification, and therefore that it should be accepted by us, is one thing; to assert that from the first it was subject to correction, that there was no day of clear knowledge from which we have received it, but that it comes to us from the twilight and has constantly had fresh light thrown upon it up to the present, and will with increase of knowledge have still more light which will necessitate still further modifications, is quite another thing. And these two views are contradictory and cannot be properly combined, as they are combined, if we rightly understand the passages before us. Reason may indeed examine the claims which tradition has upon our acceptance, may track it to its sources and test its origin, but to tamper with tradition is to destroy it. Counsel will naturally examine evidence, get to the root of it, see that it really is evidence, contend, it may be, that a portion of it is not, base arguments upon the portion which is; but the counsel who would be bold enough to "rectify" his witnesses would not be likely to gain his verdict from an intelligent jury.

It is true that in the view which we are examining, care is taken to distinguish between the details of the tradition which are constantly fluctuating, and the substance which is to remain to the end. But questions at once arise as to what are details

\* "Christus Comprobator," p. 33. † Ibid., pp. 38-9.

and what is substance. Who is to determine? When the Bishop comes to a more formal statement of his "rectified traditional view," it is as follows:

"The rectified Traditional view may be conveniently expressed under the following formulated statements:

"We have full reason for believing—

"1. That the Book of Genesis was *compiled* by Moses—in its earlier chapters from primeval documents,\* which may have been brought by Abraham from Chaldaea, and in its later chapters (except parts of xxxvi.), from family records of a distinctly contemporaneous origin, which we may reasonably believe to have been preserved in the families of the successive patriarchs as the archives of their race. That these should have been accessible to the divinely appointed leader of the race, himself a man of known learning,† that he should have arranged them and illustrated them by contemporary notes, is a supposition so reasonable, that, though no more than a supposition, it may be accepted at least as more plausible than any other which has yet been advanced.

"2. That, of the four remaining Books of the Pentateuch, the first, the Book of Exodus, as the autobiographical character of large portions of it seems clearly to indicate, was *written* by Moses, or, at least, under his immediate direction and authority. That the Book of Leviticus, as containing the statutes and ordinances for the most part expressly stated to have been revealed to Moses, must, if not actually written by him, have been compiled by authorized scribes under his immediate supervision. That the Book of Numbers, as containing more mixed material, may be considered to have been compiled—in part from the legislative revelation made directly to Moses, in part from contemporary records made by Moses in obedience to God's command,‡ in part from documentary annals including references to books § that may have been compiled during the lengthened abode in the wilderness—but all, as the tenor of the whole Book, and its concluding verse seem distinctly to imply, under the authority and general oversight of Moses. . . . Finally, that the Book of Deuteronomy, containing as it does, not without notes of time and place, the addresses of the closing days of the inspired

legislator (which we may regard as having been specially recorded and preserved by official writers||), assumed its present form, as one passage seems in some degree to suggest,\*\* under the hand of Joshua."††

And so on with Joshua and the remaining Books of the Old Testament. We must, however, refrain from further quotation, and these extracts will suffice to show what the "rectified" view is, and cover the part of the subject which is both the most debated and also that to which our present notice is confined.

Now it occurs at once to our thought that this view is indeed highly "rectified," but that it is not quite clear what claim it has to be considered "traditional." It speaks now of "full reason," now of "supposition"; here we read "seems clearly to indicate," here "must . . . have been compiled," "may have been compiled"; here "as the tenor of the whole Book and its concluding verse seem distinctly to imply," here "as one passage seems in some degree to suggest." But all this and much more of the same kind belongs not to tradition but to reason, not to objective evidence but to subjective argument. We are at once placed upon the plane of the so-called "higher criticism" itself: the evidence is drawn from the contents of the books, not from any authoritative statement about them—it comes from within, not from without, and we think it may justly be called "analytical" rather than "traditional." Its basis is in the appeal to reason, a position which we are very far from deprecating; but we must point out that he who appeals to Cæsar must be content to go to Cæsar. He cannot claim to plead in the courts of Reason, and then fall back upon the hereditary privilege of Tradition. To the courts of Reason we shall return hereafter, when we shall have before us the pleas on either side. Meanwhile we must seek to make out on surer lines than those of "rectified tradition" what Tradition has to teach us. We shall find the answer to a large extent made out for us in several of the works which we are considering, and in a specially convenient form in the pages of Westphal and Holzinger.

What then is the tradition as to the authorship of the Books of the Law which "has existed for two-and-twenty centuries"? It is to be noted, before this question can be answered, that we are

\* Here follows a note to show that there may have been documents extant at the early date referred to.

† Acts vii. 32.

‡ Numb. xxxiii. 2; see also Exod. xvii. 14.

§ Numb. xxi. 14, 27.

See Girdlestone, "Foundations of the Bible," pp. 21, 24. London, 1890.

\*\* Deut. xxxiii. 44.

†† "Christus Comprobator," pp. 46-8.

placed by this period at a date more than a thousand years later than that of Moses. During this interval were composed nearly all the post-Mosaic Books of the Old Testament, and it is natural to ask what they tell us of the authorship of the Books of the Law. Too much stress must not be laid upon the *argumentum ex silentio*, and, when the indications are so slight, too much importance must not be attached to them; but at the same time it cannot be regarded as insignificant that the general resultant from the only passages which refer to the authorship of the Law is, that they not only make no reference to Moses, when such a reference would have been natural if the writer had held Moses to be the author, but that they imply more than one author. What impression is naturally formed by one who has no preconceived theory on the subject when he reads these words in the Second Book of Kings?

"Turn ye from your evil ways, and keep my commandments and my statutes, according to all the law which I commanded your fathers, and which I sent to you by my servants the prophets."<sup>1</sup>

Or these from the prophecy of Zechariah?

"lest they should hear the law, and the words which the Lord of hosts hath sent in his spirit by the former prophets."<sup>2</sup>

Or these from the Book of Ezra?

"for we have forsaken thy commandments, which thou hast commanded by thy servants the prophets . . ."<sup>3</sup>

followed as they are by a quotation from Deuteronomy.<sup>4</sup>

We find, on the other hand, express mention of Moses in the prophecy of Isaiah:

"Then remembered he the days of old, [? Moses and] his people. . . . That led them by the right hand of Moses with his glorious arm."<sup>5</sup>

But he is named not as an author, but as a leader of the people. By Jeremiah Moses is coupled with Samuel, not as a writer, but as an intercessor for Israel.<sup>6</sup> By Micah he

is similarly grouped with Aaron and Miriam.<sup>7</sup> By Hosea he is referred to without being named as "a prophet" by whom "the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt."<sup>8</sup> It is not until the post-Exilic Malachi that we find any mention in the Prophets of the "law of Moses my servant,"<sup>9</sup> and only in the prayer of Daniel do we read, "as it is written in the law of Moses,"<sup>10</sup> though even this falls far short of asserting that the law was written by Moses.

If we turn to the Historical Books, we find in the Kings clear knowledge of a written law of Moses,<sup>11</sup> but the references are confined to Deuteronomy, and there is no statement of authorship. The composite Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, which in our English Bibles appear as four Books, but in Hebrew as two only, and form probably one continuous work, imply knowledge of our Pentateuch and of a written codex, and perhaps also of Mosaic authorship of some portions of them;<sup>12</sup> but the present form of this composite work cannot with certainty be dated earlier than B.C. 332, and is possibly to be dated at least half a century later. A comparison of the statements by the Chronicler with the original in the History on which it is based, is suggestive. Both quote, *e.g.* in the account of Amaziah, a passage in Deuteronomy;<sup>13</sup> but the History prefaces it with the formula, "according unto that which is written in the book of the law of Moses,"<sup>14</sup> which in the Chronicle becomes, "as it is written in the law, in the book of Moses."<sup>15</sup> A comparison of the accounts of Josiah's reform is still more instructive. In the History the statement is simply, "I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord,"<sup>16</sup> *i.e.* the substance but not the present form of Deuteronomy; in the Chronicle this statement is repeated, but with an added preface, "Hilkiah the priest found a book of the law of the Lord given by Moses."<sup>17</sup>

The outcome of all this is that down to about the year B.C. 300 there is no external proof whatever of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, nor indeed of its existence as a writing.

Nor does the Pentateuch, when it comes into existence in its present form, make any

<sup>7</sup> Mic. vi. 4.

<sup>8</sup> Hos. xii. 13.

<sup>9</sup> Mal. iv. 4; cf. iii. 7.

<sup>10</sup> Dan. ix. 12, 13.

<sup>11</sup> 1 Kings ii. 3; 2 Kings xiv. 6, xxi. 8, xxiii. 25. Cf. 2 Kings x. 31; xvii. 13, 34, 37.

<sup>12</sup> 1 Chron. i. 1-9; 2 Chron. xxiii. 18, xxv. 4, xxx. 16, xxxiii. 8.

<sup>13</sup> Deut. xxiv. 16.

<sup>14</sup> 2 Kings xiv. 6.

<sup>15</sup> 2 Chron. xxv. 4.

<sup>16</sup> 2 Kings xxiii. 8.

<sup>17</sup> 2 Chron. xxxiv. 14.

<sup>1</sup> 2 Kings xvii. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Zech. vii. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Ezra ix. 10, 11.

<sup>4</sup> Deut. vii. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Is. lxiii. 11, 12.

<sup>6</sup> Jer. xv. 1.

claim to be considered the writing or the work of Moses. It makes no such claim for the whole; it makes no such claim for any separate Book. There has never existed a Hebrew or Greek title for the Pentateuch, or any one of its five parts, which attributes it in any sense to Moses. So far from this being the case, when we come to portions which Moses was specially directed to write down or did write down, attention is directed to this fact as an exception to the general rule;\* so that if we press the statements of the Pentateuch itself as to its own authorship, the result is to obtain a declaration that the bulk of it is not Mosaic.

The learned prelate, whose work has led us to make the foregoing remarks, does not indeed assert that anywhere in the Pentateuch itself, or in any other writing of the Old Testament, is there even the germ of the tradition which he rightly says "may in substance be recognized as dating from the time of the Apocrypha."† But he does not seem to us to realize the force of the admission which he necessarily makes. "To begin with . . . the time of the Apocrypha" is to hang the chain too low. It is fixed, not in the solid beam, but in the plaster with which later centuries have covered the beam; and it is therefore supported only as long as no weight is made to depend from it. And how significant is this absence of any beam to which the chain can be attached! It is *a priori* possible that the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch should be, in these last days of the nineteenth Christian century, a cardinal doctrine of our faith, which it is all-important that we should accept; and yet that one of the most learned prelates of our day should be able to discover no trace of the doctrine in the whole range of the Old Testament Scriptures, extending over a thousand years, though passage after passage occurs where, had it been held and had it been thought important, it must have been stated?

And if we examine the plaster which covers the beam, we find at once that it cannot hold. We are referred to the scriptures of the Apocrypha, though an authority, which our author would at once acknowledge to be binding upon himself as well as upon the clergy to whom his remarks were first addressed, directs us that these are Books which "the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them

to establish any doctrine."‡ But not to lay any stress upon this, let us ask what does the Apocrypha really teach us as to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, or of any portion of it? Our author quotes or refers to six passages.§ We confess that we turned to them with almost impatient expectation of learning something which we did not know before. We cannot, however, find in five of them any reference, direct or indirect, to Moses, or to any author of any Book. They are adduced to prove that which is not questioned. In the sixth the Bishop finds a special ascription of sacredness "to the Mosaic law and to its author, into whose soul Wisdom herself vouchsafed to enter." We shrink from discussing the meaning of words with so high an authority, but we ask our readers to study the verse which is quoted—and we here reprint it with that which precedes and follows it:

"She delivered the righteous people and blameless seed from the nation that oppressed them. She entered into the soul of the servant of the Lord, and withstood dreadful kings in wonders and signs; rendered to the righteous a reward of their labors, guided them in a marvellous way, and was unto them for a cover by day, and a light of stars in the night season."

We ask them to study the whole of this grand description of Wisdom in action,|| and determine whether there is any ground for interpreting it of writing or authorship in any sense.

We must confess also that we are as much surprised at the absence of verses of the Apocrypha which are not quoted as at the presence of those which are. Our author might have quoted a passage in which "the law which Moses commanded us" is clearly identified with Wisdom,¶ though even this falls far short of any assertion of direct Mosaic authorship. Moreover, if the Apocrypha is to be adduced in evidence, it seems natural that we should be directed not to verses in 1 Esdras which makes no reference to authorship, but to the familiar passage in 2 Esdras,\*\* which gives a detailed account of how the law, having been destroyed by fire, was with many other books reproduced under the Divine guidance, not by Moses, but by Ezra. There is

† Articles of Religion, vi.

§ Eccles. i., Prologue; 1 Macc. xii. 9; Wisd. x. 16; Eccles. (sic, but Eccles. must be meant) xlviii. 25; 1 Esdras i. 47; Wisd. vii. 27.

¶ Capp. x. and xi.

|| Eccles. xxiv. 23, interpreted by the preceding verses of the same chapter.

\*\* Capp. xiv. and xv.

\* Exod. xvii. 14, xxiv. 3, xxxiv. 27; Numb. xxxiii. 2; Deut. xxvii. 8, xxxi. 9, 24.

† "Christus Comprobator," p. 40.



much in this vision which is mere fulness of Oriental phantasy. It takes its place with the parallel story of the pseudo-Aristean origin of the LXX., as part of the efflorescence with which a too luxurious soil has covered the truth which it has produced; but it does not follow that the vision is to be wholly rejected. In any case it represents an actual tradition coming to us from the date of the Apocryphal writings, and the only tradition which those writings assert or support.

If we follow the custom of our best Anglican divines, we shall in a matter of this kind lay great stress on a *catena patrum*. "Esdras," it is stated in a passage which is wrongly attributed to St. Augustine, but it is not the less valuable as evidence of opinions commonly held, "Dei sacerdos, combustum a Chaldeis in archivis templi restituit legem. Nempe qui eodem spiritu quo ante scripta fuerat plenus fuerit;"\* and this view is more or less distinctly asserted by Irenæus and Tertullian, by Chrysostom and Basil.† We have sought without success for any patristic support for the application of the texts quoted by our author to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

Nor is this the only plaster covering into which the chain of tradition has been fixed instead of in the beam itself. The Bishop whose arguments we are following does not refer to the "Men of the Great Synagogue." It is to be presumed that he attaches little importance to the tradition which is said to have been handed down by them; it may be that he is not convinced that the men themselves ever really existed, and that he therefore passes over them in silence. If this be so, we are to a large extent in agreement with him; but if what may be called the Greek or Alexandrian stream of tradition, lost though it is in the deserts, is accepted as evidence of the authorship of the Hebrew Scriptures, it seems right to place by the side of it the Jewish or Rabbin stream, which can scarcely be thought less clear or less authoritative. It is true that we have no proof of the existence of this tradition earlier than the Talmud, but the opening sentences

of the *Pirke Aboth*‡ declare in express words, that "Moses received the law on Sinai and handed it on to Joshua; Joshua to the elders; the elders to the prophets; the prophets to the men of the Great Synagogue; . . . Simon the Just, one of the last of the Great Synagogue, to Antigonus of Socho"; while another Rabbinic maxim informs us that "the men of the Great Synagogue wrote Ezekiel, the Twelve Prophets, Daniel, and Esther; and Ezra wrote his own Book and the genealogies in the Chronicles down to his own name."§ Argument is not needed to show that these statements are entirely untrustworthy; and the outcome of a critical examination of the pre-Christian sources—whether Hebrew or Greek—is that they give us no authoritative tradition as to the origin of the Old Testament Scriptures, and still less do they supply any such tradition as to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

When we come to the next link in the Bishop's chain—the evidence of Philo and Josephus—the witness to the Mosaic authorship becomes clear and undoubted. His statements indeed, and the references which support them, fail to do justice to his position, and it is much more forcibly stated by many other writers.¶ But Philo and Josephus do not in any case carry us back further than the Judaism of the first Christian century. Neither of them is a writer of critical weight, and neither of them gives any authority for his statements. They accept and re-state the views which were commonly held in the Græco-Jewish circles in which they moved, not shrinking from, though wondering at, the statement that Moses wrote the account of his own death and burial at the close of Deuteronomy.¶ That in the period which is roughly indicated by the three centuries before Christ, there grew up a widespread belief—widespread but by no means universal, as we have seen and shall see—that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, is admitted on all hands. What those who formed and taught this belief first meant by it, is by no means certain. It is difficult, perhaps impossible with our Western nineteenth-century ideas of authorship and books, to place ourselves in the position of the Jewish scribes two thousand years ago; but it cannot in any case be proved that by the term "Book of Moses," or "written by Moses," was meant anything more than

\* "De mirabilibus Scriptis," ii. 33; Ed. Benedict, iii., App. p. 23.

† Cf. *catena* in Ryle's "Canon of the Old Testament," Excursus A, which, however, does not include St. Augustine. The passage is quoted in Westphal, "Les Sources du Pentateuque," i. 17, without any hint that it is not genuine. This is one of several instances which we have noted of the need, in reading M. Westphal's interesting book, of careful verification of references. If the tract can be traced to British ground, for which there is strong internal evidence, it shows how widely the tradition was accepted.

‡ i. 1, 2.

§ "Baba Bathra," 15a.

¶ Cf., e.g., Holzinger, "Hexateuch," pp. 9, 10.

¶ Philo, "De Vita Mosi," iii. ad fin.; ed. Mangey, ii. 179. Josephus, "Antiq.," i. 18, 26, and iv. 326.

that Moses was the central figure of the book, as in the parallel case of "Book of Joshua," which no one holds to have been written by Joshua. Nor can we trace the steps by which this belief was generated and established. That portions of the Law were, in the strictest sense, written by Moses, *i.e.* by his own hand or under his immediate direction, is admitted; that portions were transmitted orally, and other portions committed to writing for the use of the priests only, is in a high degree probable; that other portions were written later, and that, without any intention whatever to deceive, these were added to the collection of mss. which had now become known as the Law, and named from Moses, the central Lawgiver; and that the whole had passed through more than one series of editorial emendations, is at least in accord with the circumstances. To speak as some have spoken of such an extension of the term "Law," or of the attribution of the name "Moses" to portions which are in

the spirit of the "Law" and of "Moses," and for this reason became identified with him and with his work, as "pious fraud" or "forgery," is entirely to misunderstand the period and the people. And those who by the use of such terms seek to defend the Holy Scriptures, are drawing from its sheath a double-edged sword which may inflict most serious wounds on the arms that seek to wield it.

In the teaching of our Lord we reach a crisis in the course of tradition which is indicated by the title of the work which we are considering—"Christus Comprobat." If the Christus has really given a decisive utterance on this question, then for the Christian it is finally closed. There can be no appeal. Doubts as to the correctness of the utterance are not consistent with whole-hearted allegiance to the Master's claims. The Bishop devotes to this subject the chief part of his work, and prefaces it by an inquiry as to the rightfulness and the validity of the appeal.

## LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

### BOOK REVIEWS.

CONDUCTED BY REV. CHARLES R. GILLET, LIBRARIAN OF UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

#### LIFE OF PUSEY.\*

##### *Third Notice.*

THIS is but natural, for already the drift of the Movement towards Rome had become alarmingly apparent. There is something pathetic about the repeated evidence of Pusey's efforts to hold back Newman and others from the final plunge into the lap of Rome. He was led to defend the Reformation against Newman, and rather laboriously to find points of agreement with him. He resentfully complains that he and his friends are singled out as black sheep, and hints that this will drive them to Rome—a singular argument amply discredited by the events of late years. For what was once called "Puseyism" has long ceased to incur Episcopal displeasure; yet it yields a yearly harvest of perverts to Rome. But even while thus complaining he was seeking to bolster up his own adhesion to the English Church by numbering the many proofs he believed he saw of new life in the Church at home and abroad. This was early in 1843. Then came Pusey's famous sermon, "The Holy Eucharist: a

Comfort to the Penitent." The scene is thus described by Mozley:

"The audience listened with the attention it always does to Dr. Pusey, and then the audience went away. There were the usual effects of edification and admiration produced. The remarks upon it were pretty much the same as usual; it was pronounced a useful sermon, an eloquent sermon, a striking sermon, a beautiful sermon. Some said it was a long sermon, others said that it was no longer than usual. It was, of course, said to contain high doctrinal views on the subject treated of; but as all Dr. Pusey's sermons contain high views, there was nothing to draw attention in this remark. In short, it was one of Dr. Pusey's sermons; the audience recognized that fact, went home, were perfectly at their ease, thought nothing more about it—the reverential impression excepted, of course, which that preacher's discourses always leave on the mind—when all on a sudden comes, like a clap of thunder on the ear, the news that the Board of Heresy is summoned to sit on Dr. Pusey."

The somewhat complicated history of this event is here told for the first time in detail. The facts are, however, important rather in their result than in themselves. They precipitated the crisis; Seager, his

\*"Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey." By H. P. Liddon. Edited and prepared for publication by the Rev. J. O. Johnston and the Rev. R. J. Wilson. In four volumes. Vols. I and II. London, Longmans, Green & Co. \$4.50 per volume.

Hebrew lecturer, went over to Rome, and then, after many more struggles on Pusey's part, Newman himself. Dr. Liddon must himself interpret in his own way this crisis:

"To those who did not know Pusey, his attitude towards Newman during the years 1844 and 1845 may have appeared unintelligible. Pusey's own unshaken and unshakable faith in the English Church warranted him in taking what in any other less sure of his ground would have been liberties with his own position. He could not at first bring himself to think that Newman would ever desert a cause the claims of which appeared to himself to be so entirely unassailable by controversy. When at last it was forced upon him that Newman would become a Roman Catholic, he endeavored to reconcile his own unswerving love of and deference for Newman with his absolute faith in the Presence of Christ with the English Church, by the supposition that Newman was, at any rate for a time, the subject of a special call or deputation, having for its object the promotion of some great blessing and improvement in the Roman Church; and, therefore, that his secession was no more entitled to general imitation than was the mission of the prophet Jonah to Nineveh. He could not even bring himself to allow that Newman was doing wrong, though he held that it would have been wrong indeed in himself or any other member of the English Church to follow his example. Such a position is, of course, open to obvious criticism; but the heart has a logic of its own, which is often, in point of courage and generosity, more than a match for that of the bare understanding. It was so in this case. Pusey accompanied his friend as far as his conscience would allow; even when he could no longer agree with him, he clung, as it were, to his hand, with unabated friendship which many mistook for agreement. When, however, Newman at last took the final step, Pusey drew back and parted from him, with deep sorrow of heart, but with absolutely unimpaired convictions. He quietly resumed those general duties to the Church at large imposed on him by God's providence—duties which had now become far more burdensome by the loss of his dear friend and great associate."

Amidst those "general duties" the *Life* for the present leaves Pusey.

We have said nothing hitherto as to the literary characteristics of the work. It is a triumph over difficulties, for despite the

constant interruption of the narrative by letters it is always clear and readable. As a contribution to ecclesiastical history and as a personal tribute to a career of extraordinary influence it is not likely to be surpassed—unless it be by itself. For two other volumes are promised at an early date.

CHRISTIANITY AND EVOLUTION. By James Iverach, M.A., D.D., Professor of Apologetics, and Exegesis of the Gospels in the Free College, Aberdeen. New York, Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House, 1894. Pp. 232. Price 75 cts.

This neat little volume is the fourteenth in that excellent series of biblical studies known as *The Theological Educator*. The volumes of this series already issued all treated topics more or less distinctly biblical or theological. The volume before us takes up a much-debated subject, which lies in the borderland between science and revelation. For nearly a generation the claims of natural evolution have been before the world, and its principles have been applied to almost every department of human inquiry. Darwin, Huxley, and Haeckel have applied these principles to biology and anthropology, Herbert Spencer, Tylor, and Romanes have endeavored to solve the problems of psychology and ethics by means of evolution, while Spencer and Fiske have sought to explain the facts of religion in the same way.

It was evident that the relations of evolution (even if it be nothing more than a working scientific hypothesis) and Christianity would sooner or later come up for discussion. The evolutionist at times seemed to think that his new-found laws destroyed the Christian system altogether, while the theologian sometimes began to tremble for the ark of God. Of late years the evolutionist has been taking much more cautious ground, and the theologian has been able to make a most effective defence of the foundations of theistic belief, and of divine revelation. It has been shown that atheistic or materialistic evolution is quite untenable, and that theistic evolution may be, if allowed as a fitting term at all, merely a new name for an old form of belief.

It is a great satisfaction in these circumstances to read a treatment of this burning question like that which our author has given us. His plan of treatment is simple and clear, as the following chapter titles will show: Evolution and Beginnings, Evolution and Law, Nature and Intelligi-

bility, The Strife Against Purpose, Evolution and Creation, Organic Evolution, Super-Organic Evolution, Evolution and Psychology, Evolution and Ethics, Evolution and Religion. These titles also show how comprehensive the range of the discussion is, and it also makes it impossible to give detailed review of the questions raised in the limits at our disposal in this notice.

Our author shows that evolution, whether in the hands of Spencer, Pearson, or Huxley, cannot account for the beginnings of things, and he also shows that it is not inconsistent with law, indeed must presuppose it. He also shows very finely that nature is intelligible, and consequently cannot be the product of blind force, but must be caused by intelligence.

The facts of purpose are not explicable by chance, and so theology, our author shows, is not destroyed by evolution; and so in like manner he argues that creation and evolution are not inconsistent. Here perhaps, as also in the two able chapters on organic evolution, our author concedes too much to the evolutionist. To admit that organic evolution is virtually proved is, in our judgment, going beyond the evidence in the case. To allow that it is a very useful working hypothesis is about as far as we feel that the evidence allows us to venture, and on the side of science our verdict would still be *not proven*.

The chapters on the bearing of evolution on the higher realms of existence are, to our mind, the best in the book. The inadequacy of the evolutionary principle to explain the facts of mind, of morals, and of religion is very finely brought out. Here writers like Spencer, Weismann, Huxley, Romanes, and Wallace are handled with large intelligence and clear insight by our author. In every higher realm of being and activity he shows that these are factors which cannot have come alone from the lower. We have read these concluding chapters with very much satisfaction, and commend them, as indeed the whole discussion of our author, to the earnest attention of all who wish to reach strong, sound views upon this perplexing subject.

In closing this brief notice we make two remarks of a general nature suggested by our perusal of this able little treatise.

First, we have noticed again and again that in the writings in support of evolution there is much ambiguity and confusion in the use of terms. The term *evolution* itself is used in many senses, so *selection* and *heredity*, as well as other terms, are ill-defined. But to our minds the most striking

instance of confusion is the use of the term *species* in Darwin's great work on "The Origin of Species." We are simply stating the fact in case when we say that nowhere does Darwin define this term, and everywhere he seems to use it as interchangeable with *variety*. Theologians may not be free from fault in the use of their terms, but exact science is inexcusable if it uses its terms ambiguously, or fails to define them.

Secondly, we have also been impressed with the way in which the natural evolutionists ignore the law of causation. They can, without any hesitation, rise from lower to higher forms of existence, and yet never dream of providing a cause for the production of the higher. Either the *process* is suddenly endowed with *causal* agency, or we have an effect in the higher for which no cause has been provided from the terms of the lower. Thus materialistic evolution gets the vital from the non-vital, the mental from the non-mental, and so on to the highest forms of being, and cannot, in the nature of the case, announce a cause for the change, or for the new factors in the higher forms of being.

The theistic evolutionist is not open to this charge, for the divine causality is at hand in his theory, but for him evolution is merely the natural history of the process which the divine causality produces.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

#### GOD'S CITY.\*

"AND He said, Whereunto shall we liken the Kingdom of Heaven? Or with what comparison shall we compare it?" Canon Holland replies by comparing it to a city. In this he is in line with many worthy men of all the Christian ages. *De Civitate Dei* has been the form under which many within the Kingdom have conceived of it, both before and since the days of Augustine of Hippo. St. Paul thought of it as a building of stones after the fashion of a gorgeous temple to God. The Seer saw it come down out of heaven in the likeness of a new city of Jerusalem. Thomas of Celano sang of

"Jerusalem the golden, with milk and honey  
blest,  
The sweet and blessed country, the home of  
God's elect,  
The sweet and blessed country that eager hearts  
expect."

\* "The Coming of the Kingdom," by Henry Scott Holland, D.D. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York.



But it is worthy of serious thought that this is precisely one of the things to which the Master did not liken or compare his Kingdom. He never compared it with a city or a political state. The reason is plain—it would have been scientifically inexact to do so. This political conception of the Kingdom did take possession of the Christian consciousness very early, and has maintained itself with strange tenacity, but it is hardly, if at all, compatible with the comparisons which He himself made. The essential qualities of a city have little in common with those of a lump of yeast. A political empire has little resemblance to a vineyard.

And yet it is not hard to see how the municipio-political notion gained its place. The disciples were Hebrews. The Hebrew idea of religion, an idea inherited and fixed through forty generations, was that religion was an affair of a commonwealth. When the Hebrew became a Christian all he did was to change the boundaries of his ideal commonwealth. Religion was still conceived by him as the possession of a political organization. From his hands the Roman took the notion, and bettered his instructor's teaching. Roman legal conceptions wove themselves into the very fabric of Western Christianity.

Now, a state or a city has boundaries which cannot be mistaken. Its frontier is clearly marked. One knows precisely where it begins and where it ends. There can never be any doubt in any instance whether one is within it or outside it. It has its clearly defined terms and conditions of citizenship. There is no room for doubt here. One is either a citizen, or he is not. It has its formulated laws, for the breach of which ignorance is neither excuse or palliation. It has its courts and legal machinery, which are for its citizens and for no one beside. It will throw its arm of protection about its own citizen, and will definitely refuse to protect any alien. All these things it must be and do, or else it is not a state.

But it is evident that these are not the qualities of the Kingdom of God. That kingdom directly reverses the requirements of a political kingdom. It has no boundaries. It cannot be said with certainty in any case whether one is a citizen of it or is not. The mode of entrance to it has nothing in common with a naturalization proceeding. It does not confine either the operation of its laws or the aegis of its protection to its own citizens. One looks in vain for any institution which is con-

terminous with the Kingdom of Heaven.

This distress has led men to seek relief from it in two empty imaginings. One is the fiction of a "Primitive Church," and the other is the fiction of "The Church Invisible." They are fictions both. One cannot point to any place or time in the past wherein the Church came any more nearly coinciding with the Kingdom of God than it does to-day. As for the fancy of an "Invisible Church," it is not worth contending about.

It would seem that the time had come to re-examine the force of the word "Kingdom" as it was upon the lips of the Master. In common speech we use the word in another sense entirely. We speak of the "Animal Kingdom," the "Vegetable Kingdom," a "Biological Kingdom." This would seem to have been our Lord's mode of speech. Take, for example, the Animal Kingdom. The phrase is indefinite, because the facts contained within it are indefinite. The kingdom has no clearly defined frontier. Its individuals enter it, not by a legal, but by a vital process. Its laws and phenomena do not confine themselves to its own area. They have to do with all things and all forces. It is multitudinous, complex, contradictory. Its characteristic quality is the presence of that protean thing which we call Life. It defies definition, but it asserts itself to the senses and the understanding. It is like heaven, like a vine and branches, like salt and animal tissue, like seed and soil, like the grain the shoot and the ear, like a mustard seed and stock and branches. It is like the Kingdom of Heaven.

The excellent thing about this book of Canon Holland is that he escapes from the political conception of the Kingdom and passes on into the biological conception of it. It can hardly be said that he does so consciously. But he does so because he is a modern man. One can hardly avoid contrasting him with that other great Canon of St. Paul's, Dr. Liddon. Canon Liddon's conception of Religion and Philosophy was dominated by that mechanical exactness which has now passed or is passing away. Formerly the educated world, including the pulpit, was logical, now it is biological. Canon Liddon's weapon was dialectics. He wielded it like a *petit maitre*. The modern world distrusts syllogisms. It has seen too many things proved and disproved with equal conclusiveness that way. It has discerned that the processes and forces of actual life are so subtle and complicated

and interwoven that the student must not be eager to arrange them finally in orderly sequence. He looks at them all as a whole, patiently, allows them to make their impression upon him, and then tries to describe the impression thus produced. This is the temper of Canon Holland. Taking all things into consideration he is probably the greatest English preacher, and he is in some ways very great indeed, greatest in that he is able to speak to the generation to which he preaches in that tongue in which it was born.

S. D. MCCONNELL.

Philadelphia, Whitsuntide, 1894.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for June contains: "Philip and His Wife," Margaret Deland; "A Summer in the Scillies," J. William White; "The Grave-digger," Bliss Carman; "The End of Tortoni's," Stoddard Dewey; "Behind Hymettus," J. Irving Manatt; "The Noonning Tree," Kate Douglas Wiggin; "Ingonish, by Land and Sea," Frank Bolles; "Hamburg's New Sanitary Impulse," Albert Shaw; "Limitation," John B. Tabb; "At the Opra di li Puti," Elizabeth Cavazza; "American Railways and American Cities," Henry J. Fletcher; "The Scope of the Normal School," M. V. O'Shea; "Some Letters and Conversations of Thomas Carlyle," Sir Edward Strachey.

THE JUNE CENTURY contains: "A Cumberland Vendetta," John Fox, Jr.; "One Summer Evening," Charles H. Davis; "Across Asia on a Bicycle," Thomas Gaskell Allen, Jr., and William Lewis Sachtleben; "Apollo and Daphne," Sarah King Wiley; "Field Notes," John Burroughs; "The Loosened Cord," Alexander W. Drake; "Edison's Invention of the Kinetograph," Antonia and W. K. L. Dickson; "Old Dutch Masters," Timothy Cole; "Visible Sound," Ellen Knight Bradford; "A Loan of Half-Orphans," Thomas A. Janvier; "Icebergs," W. P. Foster; "Pudd'nhead Wilson," Mark

Twain; "Huntington House," Edmund Clarence Stedman; "Tissot's Illustrations of the Gospels," Theodore Stanton; "The Mother of Ivan Tourguéneff," Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen; "Maurice Boutet de Monvel," Will H. Low; "On a Mission for Kossuth," W. J. Stillman; "The Nesting-Place," Edith M. Thomas; "Bookbindings of the Present," Brander Matthews; "The Magic Egg," Frank R. Stockton; "The Government of German Cities," Albert Shaw; "The Consular Service and the Spoils System," Eleven ex-Ministers of the United States.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE for June contains: "The City of Homes," Charles Belmont Davis; "A Kentucky Cardinal," James Lane Allen; "Vignettes of Manhattan," Brander Matthews; "My First Visit to New England," William Dean Howells; "French Diplomacy Under the Third Republic," Mr. De Blowitz; "Trilby, a novel, Part 6," George Du Maurier; "A Waitress," C. F. Woolson; "The Japanese Spring," Alfred Parsons; "Little Big Horn Medicine," Owen Wister; "Memories of Wendell Phillips," George W. Smalley; "God's Ravens," Hamlin Garland.

THE contents of JUNE LIPPINCOTT'S are: "The Wonder-Witch," M. G. McClelland; "Sea Island Cotton Respun," Dora E. W. Pratt; "The Passing of the Essay," Agnes Repplier; "The Rumpety Case," Anna Fuller; "The New Northwest Passage to the Orient," J. Macdonald Oxley; "The Trespasser," Gilbert Parker; "Two in the 'Other Half,'" E. Ogden Hays; "Hot Work on the Pampas," Morgan S. Edmunds; "My First Literary Acquaintances," R. H. Stoddard.

THE contents of JUNE SCRIBNER'S are: "Maximilian and Mexico," John Heard, Jr.; "The Lighthouse," Philip Gilbert Hamerton; "The Dog," N. S. Shaler; "A Portion of the Tempest," Mary Tappan Wright; "The Story of a Beautiful Thing," Frances Hodgson Burnett; "Life," Edith Wharton; "John March, Southerner," George W. Cable; "American Game Fishes," Leroy Milton Yale; "A Pound of Cure, a story of Monte Carlo," William Henry Bishop; "The Future of the Wounded in War," Archibald Forbes.

## SUBJECT INDEX TO THEOLOGICAL PERIODICALS.

### ABBREVIATIONS OF TITLES USED IN THIS RECORD.

Af. M. E. R.	African M. E. Church Review. (Quarterly.)	Meth. R.	Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)
Bapt. Q.	Baptist Quarterly Review.	Miss. H.	Missionary Herald.
Bib. S.	Bibliotheca Sacra. (Quarterly.)	Miss. R.	Missionary Review.
Bib. W.	The Biblical World.	New Chr. Q.	New Christian Quarterly.
Can. M. R.	Canadian Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)	Newb. H. M.	Newbery House Magazine.
Char. R.	Charities Review.	New W.	The New World. (Quarterly.)
Chr. L.	Christian Literature and Review of the Churches.	Our D.	Our Day. (Bi-monthly.)
Chr. T.	Christian Thought. (Bi-monthly.)	Prot. Ep. R.	Protestant Episcopal Review.
Ex.	Expositor.	Pre. M.	Preacher's Magazine.
Ex. T.	Expository Times.	Presb. Q.	Presbyterian Quarterly.
Good W.	Good Words.	Presb. Ref. R.	Presbyterian and Reformed Review. (Quarterly.)
Hom. R.	Homiletic Review.	Ref. Q.	Reformed Quarterly Review.
Kath. M.	Katholischen Missionen.	R. R. R.	Religious Review of Reviews.
Luth. C. R.	Lutheran Church Review.	Think.	The Thinker.
Luth. Q.	Lutheran Quarterly.	Treas.	The Treasury.
		Yale R.	The Yale Review. (Quarterly.)

Unless otherwise specified all references are to the May number of periodicals.

Acts, Galatia of the (F. H. Chase). Ex.  
Albanian Preacher, First Protestant (J. W. Baird). Miss H.  
American Churches (A. H. Bradford). Chr L.

American Protestant Association (J. J. Blackshear). Treas.  
Apocalypse of St. Peter (J. M. Garnett). Prot EpR.

Atonement (J. Cook). OurD.  
 Atonement, Vicarious (J. S. Banks). Think.  
 Bâbis in Persia (M. Y. De Goeze). MissR.  
 Bible, Minister's Use of His (H. T. Forster). PreM.  
 Christianity, Cosmopolitan, in the Twentieth Century (J. B. Donaldson). OurD.  
 Christianity, St. Paul's Conception of (A. B. Bruce). Ex.  
 Christian Unity, Voice from Japan (E. Snodgrass). ChrL.  
 Church Congress, Free (R. Westrope). ChrL.  
 Church Missionary Society, After Twenty Years. MissR.  
 Civilizations, Hebrew Legend of, in the Light of Recent Discovery (W. St. C. Boscawen). ExT.  
 Clark, Bishop, Reminiscences. ProtEpR.  
 Conscience (H. Graham). MethR.  
 Covenanters, Principles of the (J. M. Foster). OurD.  
 Criticism, Old Testament, Christianity and (W. T. Smith). BibW.  
 Dante Alighieri and the "New Life" (L. O. Kuhns). MethR.  
 Deluge, Antediluvians and the (J. W. Dawson). Ex.  
 Epworth League, Opportunities and perils of the (E. A. Schell). MethR.  
 Evolution and Creation (T. G. Bonney). Think.  
 Faith, Pre-eminence of (F. N. Upham). MethR.  
 Faith and Duty (G. G. Findlay). PreM.  
 Faith the Sixth Sense (J. Watson). Ex.  
 Galatians, Recent Critical Attack on (C. W. Rishell). MethR.  
 Genesis v. Long-lived Antediluvians (W. R. Harper). BibW.  
 Gifford Lectures, Prof. Pfeleiderer's, Edinburgh Reply to (J. Orr). Think.  
 Gospel, Isles and the (H. Macmillan). Think.  
 Hawaii, Shall We Annex (J. Cook). OurD.  
 Hinduism's Points of Contact with Christianity (M. M. Snell). BibW.  
 Infallibility, Inconvenient (J. B. Thomas). Treas.  
 Isaiah, Theology of (A. B. Davidson). ExT.  
 Itinerancy, Removal of the Time Limit (E. W. Caswell). MethR.  
 Jainism (J. Robson). MissR.  
 Jamaica and Old Calebar, Missionary's Experience in (J. J. Fuller). MissR.  
 Japan, Protestant Missionary Work in, for the Year 1893 (H. Loomis). MissH.  
 Japanese New Theology, Crudity of (J. L. Atkinson). OurD.  
 Jeremiah, Book of, Four Periods of the (G. Douglas). Think.  
 Jesus Christ, Ethical Teaching of, On Some Objection to the (M. Dods). Ex.  
 Jonah, Book of (J. Kennedy). ChrLit.  
 Judgment—Knowledge—Love (H. J. Foster). Think.  
 Justice, An Attempt to Give (A. Eilvart). CharR.  
 Keswick at Home (C. G. Moore). ExT.  
 Livingstone, David (E. S. Hinks). ProtEpR.  
 Malaysia (W. F. Oldham). MissR.  
 Marash Station, Central Turkey, Sketch of (M. A. Proctor). MissH.  
 Mark's, Saint, Gospel and its Ending (C. Taylor). Think.  
 Mars' Hill, Twice on (R. T. Stevenson). MethR.  
 Missionaries, How it Affects the MissH.  
 Missions, True Charm and Power of (A. T. Pierson). MissR.

Mohammedan Mystics (D. S. Margoliouth). Think.  
 Moses: His Life and its Lessons (M. G. Pearse). PreM.  
 Nevius, Rev. John L. (G. Reid). MissR.  
 Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly (J. E. H. Thompson). Think.  
 Paraclete, The (J. Robson). ExT.  
 Pastoral Epistles, Internal Evidence on the Authorship of the (W. Warren). Think.  
 Preacher and Secular Studies (J. O. Murray). HomR.  
 Preaching, Subjective Conditions Essential to the Highest Power in (W. Swindells). MethR.  
 Prophecy, Evidential Value of (W. G. Blaikie). HomR.  
 Prophecy, Hebrew, and Modern Criticism (F. H. Woods). ExT.  
 Pulpit and Art (T. D. Witherspoon). Treas.  
 Pulpit Interchange, Question of. ChrL.  
 Queen of Sheba (W. H. Ward). HomR.  
 Reality in Pulpit Speech (A. S. Hoyt). HomR.  
 Religion, Progress in (A. V. Allen). Treas.  
 Reunion, Prospects of, in America. ChrL.  
 Second Service (J. B. Shaw). HomR.  
 Sermon on the Mount, Free Translation of (E. P. Burt). BibW.  
 Smith, William Robertson (T. M. Lindsay). ChrL.  
 Smith, William Robertson (S. D. F. Salmond). ExT.  
 Social Reform, How Shall the Pulpit Deal with (B. F. De Costa). HomR.  
 Society, Individual and Social Factors of Redemption of (C. J. Wood). ProtEpR.  
 Specialist, Reign of the, in Our Schools (V. Wilker). MethR.  
 Student Volunteer Convention in Detroit (D. L. Pierson). MissR.  
 Sunday-School, Bible in the (W. G. Fennell). BibW.  
 Theism, Christian, Peerlessness of (J. Cook). OurD.  
 Unemployed, Five Months' Work for the, in New York City (J. S. Lowell). CharR.  
 Variation, Materials for the Study of (A. Macalister). Ex.  
 Visiting, Friendly, the True Charity (A. K. Norton). CharR.  
 Wilderness, Rest in the (B. Whiteford). Ex.

## CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

### The Biblical World.

Chicago, May, 1894.

Long-lived Antediluvians. Genesis V.  
 Free Translation of the Sermon on the Mount.  
 Christianity and Old Testament Criticism.  
 Hinduism's Points of Contact with Christianity.  
 Bible in the Sunday-School.

### The Charities Review.

New York, May, 1894.

Five Months' Work for the Unemployed in New York City.  
 An Attempt to Give Justice.  
 Friendly Visiting the True Charity.

**Christian Literature.**

New York, May, 1894.

American Churches.  
 Voice from Japan.  
 Book of Jonah.  
 Question of Pulpit Interchange.  
 Prospects of Reunion in America.  
 Free Church Congress.  
 Professor William Robertson Smith.

**The Expositor.**

London, May, 1894.

On Some Objections to the Ethical Teaching of Christ.  
 Galatia of the Acts.  
 St. Paul's Conception of Christianity.  
 Rest in the Wilderness.  
 Bible and Science.  
 Materials for the Study of Variation.  
 Faith the Sixth Sense.

**The Expository Times.**

Edinburgh, May, 1894.

Hebrew Prophecy and Modern Criticism.  
 Hebrew Legend of Civilization in the Light of Recent Discovery.  
 Professor William Robertson Smith.  
 The Paraclete.  
 Theology of Isaiah.  
 Keswick at Home.

**The Homiletic Review.**

New York, May, 1894.

Preacher and Secular Studies.  
 Evidential Value of Prophecy.  
 Reality in Pulpit Speech.  
 Second Service.  
 Queen of Sheba.  
 How Shall the Pulpit Deal with Social Reform?

**Methodist Review.**

New York, May-June, 1894.

Conscience.  
 Twice on Mars' Hill.  
 Dante Alighieri and the "New Life."  
 Recent Critical Attack on Galatians.  
 Pre-eminence of Faith.  
 Opportunities and Perils of the Epworth League.  
 Subjective Conditions Essential to the Highest Power in Preaching.  
 Removal of the Time Limit.  
 Reign of the Specialist in Our Schools.

**The Missionary Herald.**

Boston, May, 1894.

Protestant Missionary Work in Japan for the Year 1893.  
 How it Affects the Missionaries.  
 Sketches of Marash Station, Central Turkey.  
 First Protestant Albanian Preacher.

**The Missionary Review.**

New York, May, 1894.

True Charm and Power of Missions.  
 Jainism.  
 Malaysia.  
 Missionary's Experience in Jamaica and Old Calabar.  
 Rev. John L. Nevius, D.D.  
 After Twenty Years, the Church Missionary Society in 1873, 1883, and 1893.  
 Student Volunteer Convention in Detroit.  
 Bâbis in Persia.

**Our Day.**

Boston, March-April, 1894.

Cosmopolitan Christianity in the Twentieth Century.  
 Principles of the Covenanters.  
 Crudity of Japanese New Theology.  
 Atonement.  
 Shall We Annex Hawaii?  
 Peerlessness of Christian Theism.

**The Preachers' Magazine.**

New York, May, 1894.

Am I My Brother's Keeper?  
 Faith and Duty.  
 Moses: His Life and Its Lessons.  
 Minister's Use of His Bible.

**The Protestant Episcopal Review.**

Theological Seminary, May, 1894.

Reminiscences. Bishop Clark.  
 Individual and Social Factions of Redemption of Society.  
 Apocalypse of St. Peter.  
 David Livingstone.

**The Thinker.**

New York, May, 1894.

Mohammedan Mystics.  
 Four Periods of the Book of Jeremiah.  
 International Evidence on the Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles.  
 St. Mark's Gospel and Its Ending.  
 Isles and the Gospel.  
 Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly.  
 Judgment—Knowledge—Love.  
 Edinburgh Reply to Prof. Pfleiderer's "Gifford Lectures."  
 Vicarious Atonement.  
 Evolution and Creation.

**The Treasury.**

New York, May, 1894.

Pulpit and Art.  
 Inconvenient Infallibility.  
 American Protestant Association.  
 Progress in Religion.